*by* DANIEL DE LEON

# *The* VATICAN *in* POLITICS

## ULTRAMONTANISM:

*The Roman Catholic Political Machine in Action . . . .*

Price 50 cents

## THE VATICAN IN POLITICS

### Ultramontanism

By DANIEL DE LEON

In the editorials collected in this pamphlet, De Leon applied Marxian understanding to an anti-social phenomenon, Ultramontanism, that is (1) supported, praised and viewed uncritically by the capitalist beneficiaries of "religion in politics"; (2) denounced on the basis of reciprocal partisanship by those who are in business competition with it; (3) handled gently by "critics" who believe, or pretend, that the political content is not the essential part of the phenomenon; and (4) accepted as the chief instrument of "social justice" by its victims.

De Leon penetrated to the classrule basis of Ultramontanism. His analysis is a major contribution to the Marxian examination of society. Ultramontanism's postwar activities and alliances with capitalism add value to this pamphlet.

Read the evidence! Pass the pamphlet on to your friends!

The New York Labor News Co. (publishing agency of the Socialist Labor Party) publishes equally sound literature on Ultramontanism and other subjects touching on the social question. Send for a free catalogue.

80 pages—35 cents

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS CO.
61 Cliff St., New York 38, N.Y.

# The Vatican in Politics

## Ultramontanism

By DANIEL DE LEON

*"A second peculiarity of Ultramontanism is its confusion of religion with politics."—Encyclopedia Britannica*

We have moved.
Address mail to:

We have moved to:
P.O. Box 218
Mtn. View, CA 94042-0218

1962

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS COMPANY
61 Cliff Street, New York 38, N.Y.

| | |
|---|---|
| First printing | 1928 |
| Second printing | 1948 |
| Third printing | 1954 |
| Fourth printing | 1962 |

**(Printed in the United States of America)**

## Contents

*Preface* ..... 9

THE ENCYCLICAL ..... 15

Social problem admitted. Pope Leo XIII contends that Church must find solution, that private property must continue. Church offered as supreme arbiter of capitalist and working classes. Capitalists promised property protection and Church's aid "be the time or the occasion what it may." Workers promised reforms, advised to place unions under guidance of Church. Pope visualizes society based on corporate regimentation of workers and, if private property society comes to grief, on Church's possession of all property.

HE SEES A GLIMMER ..... 18

Anti-Catholic divines (capitalist lackeys) celebrate "inroads." One "sees a glimmer," in recognizing that "Protestants need a little backbone," i.e., common honesty. Papal-disciplined Father McGlynn, in supporting "Single Tax" movement, proclaimed his refusal to take politics from Rome. "Anti-Catholics" stood with Pope, because of McGlynn's attack on landed propery. Catholic, Protestant and Jewish capitalists as one in exploiting workers.

A.P.A.-ISM ..... 20

Career of Archbishop Corrigan of New York throws light on A.P.A.-ism, a movement designed to cut chasms in ranks of workers. A.P.A.'s supported Church on McGlynn. A

chief A.P.A.-ist, Elihu Root, praised Corrigan for attacks on Socialism.

GOOD FOR FATHER KRESS! ..... 22
Cleric attacks Socialism; avoids economic and sociologic arguments and bases opposition on fear of losing control of Catholic workers. Hierarchy imposes authoritarianism. Socialists applaud frankness and maintain that unquestioning "deference and submission" to man is socially evil. The line being drawn, sides must be chosen.

THE CASE OF FATHER TRAVASSOS ..... 25
Wife testifies that priest "annulled" her civil marriage. Court sustains and confirms her marriage as legal. Ultramontanes in rebellion against organic law of the land, but possess right to work for their kind of society, as Socialists have right to work for a decent order of things. "Politics ambushed behind religion" attempts to impose a political system that has not overthrown the one in existence. Methods of Ultramontanes are more subversive than those of any other group.

WELL FOR THE MEN OF NEFF! ..... 29
Sixty-five Catholics rebel against Church's politics, organize own Church. Ultramontanes claim (and are entitled to) political rights, but, when opposed, claim "religious" immunity. Boast of "Catholic vote," use statistics to bring political pressure, hail selves as "the most effective guarantee against Socialism." Socialists' evidence that Church works against political freedom howled at as "sacrilege."

THE "MILITIA OF CHRIST" ..... 31
Church organizes own caucus within unions. The avowed purpose "to fight Socialism." Socialism has nothing to do with devotion, worship or faith. Its concern is with economic and political issues. Church's opposition shows that Ultramontanism is not concerned with devotion, worship, faith, or religion, but with property interests, with politics. Force of circumstances tears religious mask from Ultramontanism.

AMERICAN AGLIPAYANS ..... 34
Church interdicts members over property issue. Act recalls excommunication of South American rebels against Spanish monarchy and punishment of Philippine objectors to Spanish rule. Filipinos, under Bishop Aglipa, deposed Pope so far as they were concerned.

FATHER VAUGHAN ..... 37
Priest, assuming role of capitalist political stump speaker, attacks Socialism in "Lenten sermon." Asserts Church gave freedom of speech, despite denunciation of liberty by Pius IX. Ultramontanes decry historic facts as "obscene," censor truth-telling books, would exterminate critics. Vaughan's dishonest claim contrasted with that of French Ultramontane. Ultramontane politics under attack on world-wide scale.

AN OPEN LETTER ..... 39
Socialist answer given to Ultramontanes' attempt to restrict use of mail "Every creed-founder has been a State-builder." Creeds and political movements partisan, not "bigoted." Cleft between ruling and ruled classes increases ruling class value of Ultramontanism. Intermediary political expressions being wiped out and replaced by Socialist and Ultramontane forces, the former progressive, the latter retrogressive.

FEUDALIST AND BOURGEOIS ..... 43
Ultramontane and Protestant indulge in name-calling, each

asserting his own "patriotism"—a word of double meaning to both. Feudalist and bourgeois, despite animosity, align themselves against Socialism.

ULTRAMONTANE RIOT IN BUTTE .....46
S.L.P. organizer, explaining class struggle at lawful meeting, physically attacked by Ultramontanes. Facts furnished undeniable and right to present them incontestable. However abhorrent the Ultramontanes' program, the S.L.P. defends their right to present it. But Ultramontane conduct foreshadows the rack and stake. Ultramontanism stands self-branded, a center of riot—a menace to the land.

SOCIALISM COMPLIMENTED .....50
Church's threat to form a clerical party. "Argument" is the weapon in politics. McGlynn excommunication, for political reasons, shows that Ultramontanism avoids argument and depends upon "anathema"—the threat of hell-fire. Text of McGlynn's excommunication given—a declaration of intellectual bankruptcy.

THE UNIVERSAL MONARCHY .....54
"Reunion of Christendom" based on acceptance of Pope's supremacy. Grounds offered for demand presuppose that the United States and all other countries should be under the Pope's political control.

IS IT FAIR? .....55
Cardinal, absent from Paris during massacre of Protestants, is presented in opera as consecrator of assassins' daggers. Appeal against "unfairness," however, is not on behalf of the Cardinal's character, but on behalf of Ultramontanism. The bloody record of Ultramontanism is beyond dispute. It approved modern wars of ruling classes. It threatens to rack and quarter Protestantism. It demands that Socialists be silenced "if need be with a bullet." It has death only for those who refuse to accept its temporal yoke.

GALILEO .....58
Ultramontanes "rectify" history; deny they tortured great scientist, admit they forbade him to advocate Copernican theory, "justify" selves, assert that his prison was a "palace," etc. Excuse that persecution of Galileo was in "the spirit of the times" exposes fallibility of Ultramontanes. "You make the stench of the stenchful past only worse by stirring it up."

THE "INDEX" .....61
Ultramontane censorship presented as "health" measure. Censored books included the Bible and basic scientific works, as well as great modern classics. Censorship imposed by members of a close, self-perpetuating corporation. Aim is to impose "the dead grip of Dark Ages theocratic autocracy."

SO SAY WE ALL .....65
Protestant missionary ejected from city on Ultramontane complaint. Cooperating judge and lawyer pervert law. Religion cannot be libeled. Attempt to include Ultramontanism within libel law concedes that it is a business with dollars at stake.

OUR ALLIES THE ULTRAMONTANES ....69
Bishop warns A. F. of L. delegates "to beware of Socialism if they don't want Church to form rival unions." Delegates accept threat without resentment. Socialist attitude on unions aroused fury of labor fakers and phony Socialists. The latter helped to "save" the A. F. of L. by

"splitting" the S.L.P. History of S.P. union activities sketched. Premise of Socialism is mass enlightenment. Premise of Ultramontanism is mental dependence upon a ruling hierarchy, upon mass ignorance Ultramontanism's ultimate formation of its own unions will aid the progress of the Socialist movement through its demonstration of the soundness of S.L.P. principles.

*

*Ultramontanism* ..... 77
(From the "Encyclopedia Britannica")

# PREFACE

Originally, the editorials in this pamphlet were published under the title, "Ultramontanism," a word defined by Webster's as signifying "the principles of the Ultramontanes, especially of those advocating papal supremacy." Literally, the word means "beyond the mountain." It came to be applied to the Roman Catholic political machine because Rome is "beyond" the Alps from countries in which it was sought to impose Roman Catholic polity. However, because Ultramontanism is a little known term and even though it is an expressive one, it was agreed that a new edition of this pamphlet should bear the title, "The Vatican in Politics."

It is unlikely that anyone picking up a copy of "The Vatican in Politics" will frown in puzzlement. Not only is the meaning of the title clear, but, to one who is even moderately well informed, it states a fact that is at once palpable and portentous. For, while Roman Catholic politics is still cautiously ambushed behind religion, the Vatican—meaning here the organized power that has its supreme headquarters in Vatican City—is perceptibly active, and ceaselessly so, in every department of our political life.

To what end is this activity directed? At first blush it would seem to be to the end that capitalism be saved. Actually, however, the saving of capitalism is important to the Church for the same reason that, in another age,

it was important to save feudalism. To preserve capitalist rule is to preserve conditions most favorable for the furtherance of Ultramontane ambitions. Ultramontanism has assumed the role of militant champion of international capitalism in the latter's struggle against Stalinist imperialism, not because capitalism is the ideal system of the Church, but because the ruling hierarchy is convinced that a victory for Stalinism would mean tremendous losses to the Church, both in property and power.

Nor does this mean that the Church would not accommodate itself to the conditions of Stalinist bureaucratic rule if circumstances compelled it to. As De Leon points out in the first editorial in this pamphlet, the Catholic Church "upheld feudalism, then monarchism, warning them of growing evils and possible revolutions. In the same manner. . . . she now upholds capitalism; but, above all things and forever, she upholds the Catholic Church." In view of its history, it is clear that, if Stalinist bureaucratic despotism were to complete its conquest of the world, Ultramontanism would again try to come to terms with the victor, and would endeavor to serve the new rulers as today it serves capitalism, by helping to hold the exploited workers in subjugation.

The point to note, however, is this: If the Church ever does enter the service of Stalinist industrial feudalism, it will be as an expediency—just as its service to capitalism is an expediency. By adapting itself as circumstances dictate, by utilizing the institutions and opportunities at hand, by being now "democratic," now "monarchistic," now "authoritarian," the Church is enabled to strive constantly for its own goal, which is to



return society to "the dead grip of Dark Ages theocratic autocracy."

A leading feature of the essays in this pamphlet is that they recognize the revolutionary implications of Roman Catholic political activity. The bourgeois liberal critic of the Vatican has not understood this. One moment he is expressing alarm over the intimate and friendly relations between the Vatican and Nazi-Fascist dictators. The next he is citing approvingly some "democratic" utterance of the Pope. But he does not understand that the observation of Pope Pius XI, expressing the opinion that Mussolini "was the man sent by Providence," and the brazen claim of the American Catholic hierarchy that the Declaration of Independence expresses an ancient Catholic doctrine, are two sides of a many-sided activity that aims primarily at the enhancing of Ultramontane power.

De Leon's understanding and insight derive from something more than familiarity with the dark passages of Roman Catholic history. He brought to these studies the keenest of analytical minds, and one superbly trained in the principles of logic. Above all, De Leon's remarkable studies reveal a thorough understanding of Marxism, and particularly of the stellar role of the class struggle in history, past and present.

The Catholic Church is today, and always has been, the protagonist of ruling classes. In matters of morals, marriage, science, literature, education, property, etc., it is ever on the side of medievalism, ever straining to thwart progress and enlightenment. Although insisting as always on the privileges accorded a religious body, particularly the privilege of immunity from attack, it has taken the field openly as the foe of Socialism. Yet,

simultaneously, Ultramontanism has posed as the "progressive reformer," and "corrector of capitalist abuses."

Beginning with the social encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII (one of which serves as the subject of the first essay in this pamphlet), and continuing through those of Pius XI and Pius XII, the Church has supplied plutocratic capitalism with a program for appeasing the workers that is calculated, in the words of Pope Leo XIII, to render them "content with their lot and resigned to toil, inducing them to lead a peaceful and tranquil life." This program stresses the importance of encouraging "workingmen's associations," i.e., unions, and of placing them "under the sheltering care of religion," i.e., the Church. It also urges such reform sops as profit-sharing and guaranteed wages, and laws establishing a "floor" for wages and a "ceiling" for hours.

In this connection, it is significant that the late New Deal Administration, which established "personal" diplomatic relations with the Vatican, was most active in promoting the social reforms advocated by the Church as a means of rendering the workers "content." Senator Robert F. Wagner, author of the Wagner Act (establishing the principle of State regulation of capital-labor relations, recently enlarged and amplified by the vicious Taft-Hartley Law), and foremost New Deal reformer, said in 1939 that the legislation he fathered was "inspired more by that great noble father of the great Catholic Church than any other influence except religion. I have followed as best I could these concepts and precepts and we now have on the statute books of the United States the things that Pope Leo



XIII and the later Pope Pius XI said we must do if we are to make sure of democracy [Senator Wagner's euphemism for "capitalism"] and religion."

De Leon's remarkable essays on Ultramontanism, by their revelation of Ultramontane power, resourcefulness, ruthlessness, and capacity for guile and deceit, and, above all, of the Ultramontane goal of autocratic theocracy, sound a warning that no one concerned with the emancipation of the working class, and the advancement of human society, can ignore. Nor does De Leon neglect to augment this warning with the injunction to speed with all our energy the construction of the only safe haven for freedom—the Socialist Republic of Labor.

ERIC HASS.

New York, N.Y., October 25, 1947.

# THE ENCYCLICAL*

(The People, June 14, 1891)

The Encyclical is a very plain document, which needs no interpretation by bishops and is hardly liable to misinterpretation by any sane or candid layman. It can, moreover, be summarized in very few words.

The Pope, it must be observed, does not speak ex cathedra. He admits that there is a social problem, evolved from the conditions of modern industry. He does not solve it, does not pretend that he can solve it, and contends only: first, that it cannot be solved without the assistance of the Church; and, secondly, that it should not be solved by the abolition of private property in land and in the instruments of production. Having thus reserved to the Church and denied to Socialism the right to seek a solution, he merely suggests a direction in which he believes a *modus vivendi* could be found, which, if accepted by capital and labor in deference to the Church, might be considered a good enough solution in this temporal world.

Briefly stated, his proposition is that the Catholic Church shall act as supreme arbiter between the capitalist class and the working class whenever civil authority may prove inadequate to the peaceful settlement of

*"*Rerum Novarum*," or "The Condition of the Working Classes," by Pope Leo XIII.

differences between the two classes; and he thus reasserts the historical claim of his Church to superior wisdom in temporal affairs, a wisdom that all men should recognize and submit to, in view of the perfect happiness that no one can enjoy in heaven without having shown such submission on earth.

To facilitate the recognition of this claim, and the general acceptance of Church arbitration under the new and ever-changing conditions of modern industry and society, the Pope makes promises to both classes.

To the capitalist class he promises that the Church will uphold the rights of private property, so long, at least, as the institution of private property may last. Mark the reservation: it is not only implied but plainly stated in the Encyclical; for, having upheld private property as a "natural right," and thus shown the value of Church arbitration to that class under present conditions, he points out the growing "evils" which, from a lack of observance of the corresponding "duty," may finally destroy the institution of private property. The danger is imminent: "Everyone must put his hand to the work which falls to his share, and that at once and immediately, lest the evil, which is already so great, may become absolutely beyond remedy.....As regards the Church, its assistance will never be wanting, *be the time or the occasion what it may.*" In other words, if the evil grows beyond remedy and private property is abolished, the Church will assist mankind—and itself—in the way suggested by the changed conditions. This, again, is consistent with the history of the Catholic Church. She upheld feudalism, then monarchism, warning them of growing evils and possible revolutions. In the same manner, and under the same



reservations, she now upholds capitalism; but, above all things and forever, she upholds the Catholic Church.

On the other hand, and in exactly the same line of policy, the Pope promises to the working class that the Church will so arbitrate as to improve the condition of labor, by curbing the insolence of godless employers, whose greed and inhumanity he denounces in vigorous language, by reducing the hours of work, and, finally, by so increasing the rate of wages, or the share of labor in its product, that industrious and frugal workingmen may "save money" and become capitalists themselves. To both classes he shows how the threatened institution of private property would be strengthened by the admission of large numbers of the proletariat into the ranks of property owners. Recognizing the irresistible tendency of the workingmen to combine for mutual protection, he does not attempt to dissuade them from adopting this course; on the contrary, he praises their efforts in this direction, but advises them to place their organizations under the guidance of the Church. For aught we know, the Pope may be dreaming of a new Roman Catholic Empire, in which the trades would be organized—as they were by Constantine and his successors, but with due regard for the changed conditions of production—under the direction of the Supreme Pontiff. Such was, indeed, the proposition made in 1848 by a highly religious economist; and not only the Vatican received it with favor, but the priests blessed the "trees of liberty" planted in Paris by the "Social Republic"!

The Pope evidently believes that, if the institution of private property should come to grief in spite of the

efforts of the Church to save it, all property should be vested in the Church itself.

---

## HE SEES A GLIMMER

(The People, May 6, 1900)

A meeting of anti-Catholic divines was held on the 29th instant in Masonic Temple. The gentlemen had come to celebrate the "inroads made into the Romish Church." The celebrants might have deceived everybody were it not that they are most well-known pulpit lackeys of the capitalist class. One of them, however, a rather innocent one, said a thing that indicates that he sees a glimmer, that something or other has settled down on his mind and is taking root, and that the process tends to shake his confidence in the sturdy purposes of his fellow Protestant crusaders. Said he: "Protestants need a little backbone."

What the gentleman meant was that his fellow Protestant crusaders don't walk a steady road with firm step; that he has seen them wobbling, and often caving in quite completely. He ascribes that to lack of backbone. If he were better informed, if he had eyes to discern the trees in the woods, he would realize that it was not backbone that was lacking in the cases he may have in mind, but common honesty. Yes, common honesty.

It is not so long ago when a Roman Catholic priest in this city took a political attitude which, absurd though it was, and absolutely incapable of at all promoting the interests of the working class, sent such



spasms of fear through the frame of the capitalist class, that he was promptly "disciplined" by the Roman curia. A long conflict ensued between him and his ecclesiastical superiors, extending all the way to the Roman See. His attitude, put in a nutshell, was the motto of Daniel O'Connell of old, to wit: "All the religion you want from Rome, but no politics"; he claimed absolute freedom to exercise his sovereign citizenship rights of political independence. As against this, his ecclesiastical superiors struck an attitude which, in turn put into a nutshell, was a maxim uttered at that very time by Mgr. Preston, the alter ego of Archbishop Corrigan in this city, and which ran thus tersely: "He who says, 'I'll take my religion from Rome, but not my politics,' is a fool."

The issue was thus made very clear. And what was the attitude of the Protestant divines? What was the attitude of the A.P.A.* laymen? With one accord they sided with the ecclesiastics who took their stand against political freedom.

The movement of the "anti-Catholic" Protestants is but one of a thousand and one manifestations of capitalist political and economic chicanery. It is but one of the many attempts to divide the working class; it is but one of the many attempts to conceal the fact that the Protestant capitalist will feast as readily as the Catholic or Jew capitalist on the flesh and marrow of the working class, and will enjoy the plunder levied on the Protestant workingmen not a bit less than the plunder levied on the Catholic or Jewish workingmen.

Well may a green divine, who is not up in political

*American Protective Association.

economy and social science, wonder at the wobblings of his associates in their various "crusades against evil."

---

## A.P.A.-ISM

(Daily People, May 7, 1902)

The decease of Archbishop Corrigan has produced his "career" in a number of papers. And there will be more. While the Archbishop is a thing of the past, his conduct in life is not, any more than that of any other man. It is even more alive than that of many others, in view of the station he filled. Turning, then, from that which is dead to that which lives on, the career of Archbishop Corrigan is good light by which to read the meaning of A. P. A.-ism.

There is a popular delusion that A. P. A.-ism is a protest, nay, is to be a barrier against Roman Catholicism, against the domination in America of the rule of the Vatican. No doubt many a member of the A. P. A. organization believes so himself and lives up to the principle; but that would only go to show that the delusion extends into the organization itself. A. P. A.-ism is born, not of the purposes it sets forth, but of entirely different purposes. It is born of the purpose to cut deep chasms among the ranks of the working class so as to prevent their united and then irresistible force. Accordingly, so far from A. P. A.-ism being fomented by Americans against Rome, it is fomented by capitalists, whether Protestants or otherwise, against the working class. That this is so, the career of Archbishop Corrigan demonstrates. Two episodes will suffice.



One was the McGlynn episode. Father McGlynn took the stump for the Single Tax. The capitalist class did not bother about the theory of the Single Tax. That did not alarm them. What alarmed them was the revolutionary pulse of the working class, which McGlynn awoke. McGlynn was promptly disciplined by the Archbishop, and the Pope added his excommunication. Here was a case where, if A. P. A.-ism was what it pretends to be, it should have risen in indignation. America can manage her own affairs. If a wrongful movement should start, America is amply able to handle it. Help from Rome is not wanted. Moreover, the right of free speech was assailed. If ever the Vatican insulted Americanism, it was when Archbishop Corrigan set himself up as a censor of free speech, and his creed-dogma as a gauge of economics and politics in the land. And what did the A. P. A.'s do? To a man, they and their press crawled in the dust before the "foreign potentate." And thus A. P. A.-ites and alleged anti-A. P. A.-ites went arm in arm.

The second episode was four years ago when the Archbishop celebrated the silver jubilee of his consecration as Bishop. Among the celebrants was no less an A. P. A.-ist than Elihu Root, the present Secretary of War. And on that occasion, Mr. Root picked out as *the* bright spot in the Archbishop that he "stood for the highest rights of personal liberty and for morality against the insidious misrepresentations of demagogues, Socialists and Anarchists." It adds no little point to the praise that it proceeded from a gentleman who, having in his possession full information on the atroci-

ties committed by his subalterns in the Philippines, said, "the war was conducted there upon principles that could not give offense to the most delicate sense of humanity."

The decease of Archbishop Corrigan recalls to memory these incidents in his career. None but the blind can fail to see that close bonds bind the A. P. A. and their supposed adversaries; none but the dullest can fail to perceive the nature of the "morality" that animates the said bond.

---

## GOOD FOR FATHER KRESS!

(Daily People, April 13, 1904)

Heralded by big headlines: "Vigorous Address on Evils of the Propaganda of Socialism," and preluded by praises from Father Elliot, the Washington *Times* of the 8th of this month reports an address delivered by Father W. S. Kress at the morning session of the current missionary conference at Catholic University.

It is our agreeable pleasure to be able, for once, to applaud an adversary who, in the garb, under the auspices, and in the name of the Roman Catholic Church machine, takes the field against Socialism. The applause that is due to Father Kress's effort is due to the exceptional wisdom that marked his line of argument and, withal, its sincerity. While all the other prelates, who of late organizedly took the field against Socialism, were venturesome enough to try conclusions with Socialism on a field that the gentlemen were peculiarly



unfit for—the field of economics and sociology—Father Kress wisely left that field alone, and he made the only argument that we must admit holds water. The central thought from which Father Kress's argument proceeded and toward which it climaxed appears in the following passage:

"To expect the average Catholic to discriminate between the true and the false principles of Socialism is to invite disappointment. Contamination is sure to result. Their usual deference and submission to ecclesiastical authority soon give way to an insolent questioning of the priest's right to say what is false or true, right or wrong."

We call this a clear drawing of the line.

Upon the authority of Father Kress, as appears from this passage, the hierarchy demands from its faithful not merely adherence to theological tenets, but "deference and submission to ecclesiastical authority" upon what is false or true outside of theology; that any other attitude is considered by the hierarchy as "an insolent questioning of the priest's right," and that "the priest's right" is to express himself, without there being an appeal from his utterance, upon anything he chooses —"false or true, right or wrong," covering the whole gamut of man's activity on earth. Socialism interferes, says the father, with such authoritarianism, and the father obviously considers such authoritarianism as essential to the welfare of the race.

This is not the place for a discussion upon whether Father Kress is right or wrong upon what is good for the human race. Such discussion is unnecessary. Father Kress is of the opinion that blind deference and sub-

mission are required by his church organization—he is authority upon that; and he declares that Socialism interferes with such "deference and submission"—he is right.

The point whether humanity is fit or unfit to rule itself has been amply debated. To debate it further were idle. The Declaration of Independence would still be unwritten if the Revolutionary Fathers had been willing to discuss the point. It is one of the features of that great document that it bars out the discussion. It starts out with the declaration, "We hold that," etc.; in other words, "we are through with discussion and now stand up to be counted." By bringing out as his central objection to Socialism the fact that it "contaminates" the spirit of "deference and submission," and superinduces "insolent questions"—all of which is true—Father Kress makes quite clear the intellectual line that divides him and his from the Socialists.

We have ever said it, we repeat it now—the path to progress, to order, to intelligent conclusion lies, not along the path of blurring but along the path of sharply drawing the lines that divide opinion. If the lines are blurred, neither side will know where it is at, and harmony will be furthest away when it seems nearest. On the contrary, only by a sharp drawing of the line can each side understand the other and, above all, can each side *understand itself*. Then, only then, can the error be located.

We applaud Father Kress, we applaud sincerity wherever found, and we help him to draw the line—Socialism maintains that unquestioning "deference and submission" to man is a badge of stupidity and means unhappiness; it breeds the duper and the duped; it



sweeps the race into the abyss of turmoil; it prevents peace on earth.

Socialism stands on that side of the line. Is it wrong? Then march across it to the other. The Father Kresses stand there by their own admission.

---

## THE CASE OF FATHER TRAVASSOS

(Daily People, October 19, 1909)

In the Third District Court of New Bedford, Mass., Justice Milliken presiding, the suit came up, on the 23rd of last September, of one Amancio against a Roman Catholic priest, Travassos by name. The plaintiff alleged that the priest had, through the confessional, caused his wife to leave him, thereby breaking up his home, on account of which he demanded damages. The plaintiff's allegations were supported by his wife's testimony and no attempt at rebuttal was made by the defendant. Called to the stand by the plaintiff's attorney to testify as to a certain conversation that took place between her and the priest at confession, Mrs. Amancio, the objections of the defendant being overruled by the court, said:

"He asked me if I was single or married. I told him I was married civilly, and then Father Travassos said I was not married and that I was living in concubinage. I was, therefore, he said, accursed. He told me that my husband could leave me and go to another city and marry another woman. He then told me to go home and tell my husband to come to the church and be married, or leave him, as he could not absolve

me unless I did. I was afraid then that my husband would leave me and marry another woman, so I told him what the priest had said. Since then some people have told me that my marriage was all right and just as good as any other, and so I am willing to go back and live with my husband."

On the 11th of this month, Judge Milliken ordered judgment to be entered for the plaintiff in $50.

It matters not that Judge Milliken had the mental and moral integrity to overrule the objections raised by the defendant's attorney, who sought to prevent Mrs. Amancio from repeating the priest's words to her in the confessional, on the theory that such conversations were "privileged."

It matters not that the unlawfulness of the defendant's act was established by the court, and he was mulcted in damages.

It matters not that Amancio, the husband, displayed admirable civic fortitude in seeking and obtaining legal redress under the laws of the land.

It matters not that Mrs. Amancio herself, by returning to her husband, recovered from the mental thralldom that formerly obsessed her and, by so doing, herself healed a wound that no damages at law could cure.

Any or all of these circumstances together might at first blush seem to dispose of the case of Father Travassos like that of any other common tort, and leave nothing more to be said upon the subject. It is not so.

Father Travassos and his hierarchy have a right to believe that only they have authority to solemnize mar-



riage; they have a right to believe that a man and woman, not married by them, live in concubinage; they have a right to believe that their expressions concerning concubinage are not slanderous and libelous toward those not married by them, and their children, and that such expressions should not lay them open to prosecution for slander or libel; they have a right to believe that they have the power to annul all marriages otherwise contracted, and thereby exercise the functions of a divorce court, as Father Travassos did or sought to do. They have a right to believe all these things; and, these things being at war with the existing institutions of the land, and with the principles upon which these institutions have been raised, Father Travassos and his hierarchy have the right to agitate and educate and organize with a view to bringing about that state of things in which such beliefs are organic law. To all these beliefs and acts the Travassoses have an unquestioned and unquestionable right—just the same as Socialists have the unquestionable right, and insist upon the exercise thereof, to agitate, educate and organize with a view to bringing about as radical a political revolution in the existing organic institutions of the land, in one direction, as the radical political revolution in the existing organic structure of the land in another and opposite direction, implied in the changes which Father Travassos's procedure gives an inkling of.

All this is cardinal. Cardinal, therefore, also is the conclusion that the theory of Father Travassos and his hierarchy, all the more inasmuch as the latter has not disavowed the former, is that of a political movement; that their methods are not the open methods of political struggles but the methods of politics ambushed be-

hind religion; that their conduct is the attempted enforcement of a political system that has not yet overthrown the one today in existence in the land; finally, that their posture is one of "imperium in imperio" (a supremacy within a supremacy), a state of things repugnant to and exclusive of the elemental concept of social order.

The facts cited, together with the inevitable conclusions just mentioned, demand close attention, all the more in view of the loud protestations of the Travassoses and their hierarchy of law-abidingness in the land, and their simultaneous charge preferred with indignation against Socialism as subversive of law. The juridical facts cited and the conclusions that flow therefrom prove unerringly, for one thing, that the goal of the Travassoses and their hierarchy is as subversive of existing law, in one direction, as the goal of Socialism is subversive in the opposite direction; for another thing, that the methods of the Roman Catholic political machine transcend in subversiveness all the revolutionary movements of our generation, Anarchism not excepted, in that, differently from these, the methods of the Roman Catholic political machine attempt an "imperium in imperio"—an onslaught upon elemental principles of social life.

The case of Father Travassos is not disposed of by the firm conduct of Judge Milliken, nor by the restoration of the Amancio home. There is vastly more in the case of Father Travassos than in a common tort.



## WELL FOR THE MEN OF NEFF!

(Daily People, January 2, 1911)

Sixty-five men is not a large number. Sixty-five men is a small number. But sixty-five *men,* especially when operating at the right season, are a legion. They are like the inconsequential-looking acorn which encloses the broad-crested, wide-branched oak of the morrow. Of this caliber are the sixty-five Polish Roman Catholics of the mining town of Neff, Ohio, who—discovering that what they had fondly believed to be a purely devotional organization, the Roman Catholic Church, was essentially a political machine that shields their exploiting capitalists and, accordingly, bitterly opposes their own Socialist political convictions—pulled out of that Church, organized a new Polish-Slavonic Catholic Church, and affiliated themselves with a kindred national body, the National Catholic Diocese of America, incorporated under Ohio laws.

The constitutional guarantee of freedom of conscience is one of the great conquests of civilization. It safeguards the devotional preferences of the individual, These none shall touch or molest; they are matters of private concern. So priceless is this private and individual freedom that manhood is enlisted in seeing that it shall not be made a cloak for ulterior purposes. On the same principle that freedom of the press is guarded by provisions that protect the freedom from becoming a weapon for recklessness and blackguardism; on the same principle that freedom of speech is guarded by provisions that protect the freedom from becoming a sport for rowdyism;—on the identical principle the freedom of conscience may not be allowed to be

"queered" by any who would turn the freedom into an ambush for politics.

The Roman Catholic Church the world over—markedly so, of recent years, in the United States—is essentially a political organization, with all that that implies. Like all other political bodies, it seeks material and political power to enforce its views. As such, as a political movement, it is entitled to all the rights of other political bodies. The same as other political bodies have their convictions, and must be free to propagate them, and are justified in seeking to convert others to their views, so likewise must the political Roman Catholic Church be credited with convictions, be safeguarded in the freedom of propaganda, and be held guiltless in the endeavor to win others over to itself. Just the same—no less and no more. The election laws of the land condense these principles in the clause that forbids any religious device upon the ballot.

The political Roman Catholic Church proceeds upon a different set of principles. It demands all the rights of a political body toward others, but denies all others the same rights toward itself. The latter it attempts under the plea of "religion." When its Washington, D.C., organ publishes statistical tables of the Congressional Districts in which the "Catholic vote" holds the balance of power, and the figures are used to bring pressure upon the government for appropriations and political appointments—that it pronounces a "legitimate exercise of political rights"; when such a maneuver is counter-maneuvered by other seekers after appropriations and appointments—that it condemns as "bigotry." When one of its high officials quotes, at the Washington Catholic University, Hanna's and Depew's



praises of the Roman Catholic Church as "the best police" and as "the most effective guarantee against Socialism"—that it applauds uproariously as "political wisdom"; when the Socialist movement turns to the pages of history and proves from them that the political regimen of the Roman Catholic Church has, wherever it has had the power, worked against political freedom, science and progress—that it howls at as "sacrilege."

Of course, such bizarre political pretenses on the part of a devotional body, simultaneous with such devotional arrogation of immunity on the part of a political body, cannot long last. The monstrous combination has not lasted in other countries. It cannot last in this, in fact it is ripping up at all corners. The path struck by the sixty-five men of Neff is one upon which hundreds of thousands are certain to follow—and that sooner than later, the star of Socialism lighting the way.

---

## THE "MILITIA OF CHRIST"

**(Daily People, January 14, 1911)**

The report from Schenectady, found elsewhere in this issue, of the move on the part of the Roman Catholic Church to organize a "Militia of Christ" among the members of the unions, gives the fullest information, so far had, upon one of the moves which, combined with many others, points unmistakably to the looming up of a clerical political party in the United States.

The Schenectady report states expressly the avowed purpose of the "Militia of Christ." Is the purpose to make converts for a special form or system of devotion, as opposed to another? No. Is the purpose to make propaganda for a special style of worship, hostile to some other style? No. Is the purpose to teach some special faith, in denial of some other or others? Yet again, no. The avowed purpose is "to fight Socialism."

That which is opposed ever explains the opposition.

Socialism is not a movement concerning devotion, worship or faith. In short, Socialism is not a religious movement. Socialism is as far from religion as free trade or protection; as monometalism or bimetalism; as forest preservation or forest private exploitation; as greenbackism or metallic money, etc., etc., etc. And Socialism is as far from religion as any and all of these for the identical reason—one and all are pivoted upon property, are reflexes of property interests, consequently are *political issues*. Just as even the most powerful microscope could not detect the faintest trace of religion in free trade, in protection, in greenbackism, etc., etc., etc., so also can no trace of religion be found in Socialism, the essence of which is the purely economic and political principle that the private ownership of the necessaries for production divides society into a class of enjoyers without toil, and a class of toilers without enjoyment. Obviously, opposition to such a movement throws light upon itself. The opposer, whatever its pretenses, is not devotion, is not worship, is not faith; in short, is not religion—it is property, property interests, in short, *politics*.

The Socialist welcomes every new trust despite the evil that accompanies it. The evil the Socialist knows



is transitory, the benefit—increased plentifulness with decreased toil—he knows is permanent and a step nearer to the Socialist Commonwealth. On the identical principle, despite the increased arduousness of facing and having to contend with one more political opponent, the Socialist welcomes every move on the part of the Roman Catholic Church to step forth openly as a political organization. The increased arduousness the Socialist knows is amply compensated for by the increased power to the cause of human progress that comes from certainty.

Again, despite all the evil incidental to the trust, its appearance is a wave of the hand with which social evolution greets and pays homage to Socialist science; fain would the capitalist class curb the trust development, this being at once a demonstration and a stepping stone to the Socialist Commonwealth; but the very law of capitalist existence drives it on relentlessly to its own undoing. Identically so in the instance of the Roman Catholic political machine. Despite the increased arduousness of the political task that it imposes upon the Socialists, its appearance as a political entity is a bow of respect and encouragement from the logic of events to Socialist intrepidity; fain would the Roman Catholic political machine keep up the mask of religion. Its experience in one European country after another, Portugal latest, teaches it, Bourbon though it be in its incapacity to learn, that its safety lies behind the mask. Yet such is the logic of events that the Roman Catholic political machine is fatedly driven forth from cover, and the mask is being relentlessly torn from its face.

It is with a shout of conscious ascendancy, and the consciousness of certain triumph, that the Socialist hails

the evidences of the Roman Catholic political machine's being steadily forced in America, as it has been in Europe, to bend to the exigencies that force it to a step that fatedly leads to the spot where it is to receive the sentence that civilization has pronounced against it.

---

## AMERICAN AGLIPAYANS

(Daily People, May 24, 1911)

Biddeford, Me., dispatches bring the news of six members of the Roman Catholic churches of that city and Lewiston, "all prominent," being interdicted by Bishop Louis P. Walsh of the Portland diocese in a general letter to the clergy read at the churches on the 14th of this month. The dispatches explain that the offense of the six prominent men was the signing, as "members of the Executive Committee of the French-American Roman Catholic Church of Maine," of a petition to the Legislature in support of a bill that sought to take the management of the property of the Church from the hands of the Portland diocese, and place it in the hands of a Board of Directors. For that act, pronounced "a grave scandal," the six men "have been interdicted the rights and privileges of the Church in the reception of the sacraments in the Diocese of Portland," and Catholic societies are warned in the letter "that if they cooperate with the above-mentioned parties under interdiction, they will be deprived of their rights and privileges as a Catholic society in the Diocese of Portland."

These are pregnant tidings, all the more in view of



the circumstance that six hundred other Catholics signed the petition to the Legislature.

The interdiction, virtual excommunication, of men, not for any lapse in morality, not for any transgression in matters of faith or religion, but for acts that strictly and exclusively affect ownership and control of property in forms and manner recognized as legal by the laws of the land—that, together with the undoubted consequences thereof, is an event in which history is repeating and will, as a consequence, repeat itself not as a farce but as the continuation of a long chain of historic events of prime magnitude.

It was no act of "heresy" that, at the beginning of last century, provoked the Vatican to excommunicate the flower of South America's population. Their offense was the taking up of arms against the intolerable tyranny and rapacity of the corrupt-to-the-bone court of Spain, and the driving of the despoilers from the land.—The act concerned *property* and was *political.*

It was no act of "heresy" that, some seventy years later, again provoked the Vatican to threaten, and its friar agents to seek to enforce the threats upon, a large portion of the Filipinos. Their offense also was the rising in revolt against the extorting Spanish government.—The act concerned, once more, *property* and was *political.*

Last year, and in this very country, at Neff, Ohio, it was no act of "heresy" that brought down upon some sixty and odd Roman Catholic parishioners condemnation from the pulpit. Their offense was to reject the economic and political tenets of capitalism and accept those of Socialism.—Again, the act concerned *property* and was *political.*

And now we have it in Biddeford, Me., where people are placed under interdiction by prelatical authority, not for "heresy," but, once again, on an issue of *property,* hence ultimately *political.*

In the South American instance, just so soon as the patriots in arms discovered behind the mask of religion agents of the political power with which they were struggling, these were, as fast as caught, made to keep company with their franker fellow political spies, pendent from the limbs of tamarind trees.

In the instance of the Philippine Islands, the Filipinos went further, in a way. The Pope in Rome being against them, they deposed the Pope so far as they were concerned, and set up a Pope of their own in Mindanao, Aglipa by name.

In the Neff, Ohio, instance, the course adopted by the sixty-odd Socialists resembled that of the Filipinos. They pulled themselves out of the jurisdiction of the capitalist politician disguised in clerical robes; set up their own religious organization—the Polish-Slavonic Catholic Church; and affiliated the same with a kindred national body—the National Catholic Diocese of America, incorporated under Ohio laws. It was an Aglipayan move.

Whither the Biddeford, Me., affair is bound to tend may be gathered, partly from the Aglipayan note easily caught from the title of the six interdicted men—"Executive Committee of the French-American Catholic Church of Maine"; and partly from the Bourbon-blind tenacity in error that marks a ruling property class, among whose satraps the Roman Catholic political priesthood have ever led in Bourbon blindness.



## FATHER VAUGHAN

(Daily People, February 29, 1912)

Unsophisticated people, people who are not yet "next" to the fact that the Roman Catholic hierarchy is a political machine ambushed behind religion, such people will wonder: What has Socialism, a political movement founded upon economic and sociologic science, got to do with Lent and Lenten sermons? People who *are* "next" to the fact do not wonder. Indeed, having a comprehensive view of the political lay of things, such people would sooner wonder to see a Lenten season opened in St. Patrick's Cathedral that does not make Socialism the burden of its howls. People who are "next" to facts, especially if they are Socialists, would be rather disappointed if they did not see a Roman Catholic dignitary wearing out his teeth on the file of Socialist fact and reason.

For such wide-awake people there was no disappointment in store when the Jesuit, Father Bernard Vaughan, made his first Lenten deliverance on February 25. Father Vaughan was "up to the mark"—the mark of the capitalist political stump speaker with whom recklessness of allegations is a characteristic, and the chucking of big bluffs, and none too big, the most cherished method.

These are some of the things that Father Vaughan said:

"There is no one of those who speak bravely against the Church today but owes it to the Church that he can speak at all."—Yet free speech and free press appear upon the list of mortal sins in the celebrated encyclical of Pius IX * Yet Roman Catholic

*"Syllabus of Errors."

agencies decry as "obscene" historic facts academically stated, simply because such facts work against the said agencies; and they even keep them from the shelves of public libraries, as they have done with the book of Dr. Alexander Robertson, "The Roman Catholic Church in Italy," which has been expurgated from the Boston Public Library. The fact is that, if Father Vaughan's political system had its way, whoever remotely criticized it would be burnt at the stake. Much greater mental integrity was displayed by the Ultramontane clericalist* in the French Chamber of Deputies who, being reminded that the freedom of criticism which he was exercising he owed to the very liberals whom he denounced, answered: "I demand of you freedom upon your own principles, and I deny it to you upon mine."

Father Vaughan also said: "Fearlessly Catholics may proclaim that the Popes, after the Reformation as well as before it, have been on the side of the toiling classes. Already there are large numbers of workingmen on whom the truth at last is beginning to dawn." —In what country are those large numbers of workingmen located? To judge by the fact that the candidate of the Catholic party, the Centrist, was defeated only last month in Cologne, the "Throne of the Center," and a Socialist was elected, likewise in Duesseldorf; the fact that France, Portugal, Italy, all of them Catholic countries, have shaken off the papal yoke and done so with toilers' votes;—all these facts do point to the truth's dawning, at last, upon large numbers of workingmen, only in a sense exactly the opposite to that asserted by Father Vaughan, while the father's noisily announced conversions of millionairesses and sisters-in-law of Presidents underscore the impression regarding the quarter of the social compass in which the truth is actually dawning.

*Louis Veuillot, Ultramontane journalist and arch-reactionary.



Father Vaughan paid Socialism the compliment of admitting its "bravery of statement." We regret we cannot return the compliment. There is no bravery, there is brazenness only in the father's statements.

---

## AN OPEN LETTER

(Daily People, April 24, 1912)

To W. W. Prescott,
Editor, the *Protestant Magazine,*
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir:

We hope you will excuse the tardiness of this acknowledgment of your favor calling our attention to the article, "A Dangerous Proposal," in this year's fourth number of your magazine, the *Protestant,* and expressing the hope that the article may not cause us to consider you an alarmist.

Whether you are an alarmist for ringing the note of warning at the action taken by the Columbus, 1911, convention of the Federation of Catholic Societies in endeavoring to enlist the services of the National Post Office Department to exclude from the mails "obscene literature, including under this title books, papers,

writings and prints which outrage religious convictions of our citizens and contain scurrilous and slanderous attacks upon our faith"—whether you are an alarmist for doing so depends. It depends upon whether your diagnosis of the issue is sound or unsound.

The moment religion organizes into a specific creed it becomes a political force. From Moses down to Brigham Young, every creed-founder has been a State-builder. Creeds being in their essence political, they fatedly reflect economic and social, in short, material conditions—and struggle for the same. As a final consequence, every creed, like every political party, naturally and sincerely holds all others wrong, itself alone the one entitled to survive. This fact is greatly blurred by the term "bigotry," generally applied to the self-centered manifestations of creeds. The term is a misnomer. As well say that a Free Trade Democrat is "bigoted," or a Protection Republican, or a Populist Free-coiner of silver, etc. No more than these are creeds "bigoted." They are all "partisan," and justly so from their premises, from the law of their existence —all being political entities.

It is important to realize this great historic fact. It tears away the mask of religion behind which political aspirations love to conceal themselves. The tearing away of the mask serves the double purpose of thwarting deception, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, of promoting a spirit of intelligent fair play on the part of any one political body toward all others, including of course the unmasked political bodies as well.

Proceeding along these lines and from these premises, so far from feeling indignation at the "present increasing strength" of the Roman Catholic political



body, the dispassionate mind will buckle down to ascertain the cause of it. The inquiry is vigor-imparting.

Wherever, in the course of social evolution, the cleft between a ruling class and a ruled class deepens and widens, the necessity for keeping down the ruled becomes more urgent. The measures to this end will ever be found accompanied by counter-measures, measures to throw off the yoke of the ruler. Once the fact is grasped that the Roman Catholic hierarchy is what the Modernists in Catholicism themselves recognize—politics ambushed behind religion, the fact of its increasing power in the country, as shown by the "conversions" of millionaires, and also the world-wide phenomenon of the gigantic rise of the Socialist political movement, will both be better understood. Each of the two acts will illumine the other—and they will cast luminous sidelights upon minor events.

Ruling classes are at best veiled autocrats. So long as the corresponding ruled class does not yet feel its historic mission to overthrow the ruling class throb in its veins, the veil of democracy is kept unlifted from the face of the rulers. In the measure that the ruled class does begin to feel its historic mission throbbing in its breast, the veil begins to be lifted. The nearer to a crisis, the stronger is the need felt by the rulers for autocratic measures. Thus we see Col. [Theodore] Roosevelt advocating executive "control" regardless of lawsuits, in short, the monarchy; thus we see his fellow class adversary, Taft, advocating court supremacy, even against "good laws," in short, an oligarchy!—and thus we see the one and the other subservient to, and ever more millionaires rushing into, the Roman Catholic political regime of intellectual despotism.

The subject is broad enough for an essay of large size. Summing up—the long and short of the story is that the great political conflict that is coming to a head is wiping out all intermediary political expressions and is bound to leave extant just two—the two types of the two opposing forces—the Socialist political body as the type of the forces that make for progress, hence, freedom; and the Roman Catholic equally political body as the type of the forces that make for retrogression, hence, slavery. These two political bodies will attract, each its own affinities. The capitalist Protestant, Jew, Catholic and whatnot will be Romanized—forget not the attitude of the Protestant A.P.A. in 1886, when Father Edward McGlynn turned his face revolutionward. Those A.P.A.'s scraped the earth, with their foreheads at the Pope's feet, when he excommunicated the noble-minded prelate; and, this very month, the news comes from Baltimore that a wealthy Jew donated $25,000 for the suppression of Socialism, to whom?—To a Jewish rabbi?—No! to Cardinal Gibbons. On the other hand, the proletarian and intelligent Protestant, Jew, Catholic and whatnot will be Socialistized;—and thus the great final debacle which has been brewing through the ages for the final overthrow of class rule, accordingly, for the final emancipation of the human race from the subjection to property, will take place.

We ourselves, and all the members of the Socialist Labor Party, were not always militants in the political body of Socialism. All the Party's members were at one time or other, directly or indirectly, affiliated with some other political body—Republican, Democratic Populist, Protestant, Jew, Catholic or of whatever



other name. The dawn of the coming day having revolutionized our heads, we see with no alarm the "gradual increase in strength" of the Roman Catholic political movement in this country. We see the development with no alarm for two reasons—first, because simultaneously the new political body of Socialism is gaining in strength, and gaining faster than the representative political body of retrogression; secondly, because in older countries, where the political body of Roman Catholicism started with a decided lead of power, it is now steadily losing ground to the Socialists.

We recommend to you that you feel no alarm.

Sincerely, etc.,
Editor DAILY PEOPLE.

---

## FEUDALIST AND BOURGEOIS

(Daily People, June 16, 1912)

The bellowings of the Roosevelt-Taft conflict tend to drown the ragings of another clapperclawing that is going on in the country or, rather, that is coming to a head—the conflict between the feudalist Roman Catholic political body and the bourgeois Protestant (we shall call it "Protestant" for lack of a better name at present) polity.

The latest incident in this fray was the exchange of amenities between the feudal patriot, Edward J. Cooney, and the bourgeois patriot, Gen. Nelson A. Miles.

Mr. Cooney, as president of the "Catholic Press Association," an agency of the feudal Roman Catholic

political hierarchy, wrote to Gen. Miles, a leading figure in the "Guardians of Liberty," a bourgeois concern, severely finding fault with the "Guardians" and the general. Mr. Cooney planted himself upon patriotism. It was as a patriot that he assailed the general and the Guardians. But his letter did not miss any of the pious-political phrases familiar to those who are familiar with the Dark Ages politico-pious phraseology of the feudal creed. "Hissing snakes" and all were trotted out in Mr. Cooney's letter.

Gen. Miles, as the leading figure in the "Guardians of Liberty" aforenamed, answered in kind;—nor were any of the earmarks that characterize the self-immolating "patriotism" of the bourgeois absent from his letter.

There is much to learn from this particular clapperclawing, especially by those who imagine that, because hostility to the Roman Catholic feudal polity marked the progress in civilization wrought by the bourgeois or Protestant revolution, therefore, bourgeois hostility to the Roman Catholic feudal polity today entitles the bourgeois brand to the sympathy of the Socialist.

As to the claims to "patriotism" made by Roman Catholic feudality through its mouthpiece, Mr. Cooney, that has been exposed or illustrated in the course of history so completely that much time is not needed to brush it aside.

The American and the Spanish "patriotism," the German and the French "patriotism," etc., etc., of the Roman Catholic feudalist means readiness to sacrifice the local interests of any or all of those countries to the interests of the papal territorial supremacy. The Roman Catholic feudalist of Germany, France, America,



Spain, etc., etc., will, it is true, ever place the flag of those countries beside the white and yellow flag of feudal Rome, but the flags of those different countries are ever in his mind subservient to the papal colors—the flag of another temporality. Accordingly, "patriotism" for America, on the lips of the Roman Catholic feudalist, is a word of double meaning—hence no "patriotism" at all. That is well established by history.

Does it not, then, follow that the bourgeois claim to "patriotism" is sincere? Not at all—at least not today.

When the bourgeois started his revolt against Roman Catholic feudalism he was sincere enough—in a way. The bourgeois of each country loved his own country as a man loves his own horse; consequently, he was too jealous to allow the bourgeois of any other country, the Roman Catholic feudal overlord of course included, to share the seat on the animal's back.

So stood things at the beginning of the reign of the bourgeois—but things have since changed.

With the development of capitalism, the bourgeois horse-conception of their respective countries gained the ascendancy until today, with capitalism internationally grown, the bourgeois of all countries have yoked all the horses into one many-tandemed team, with themselves in the chariot holding the reins for their common advantage and under a common flag—the flag with the $ coat of arms. Accordingly, "patriotism," on the lips of the bourgeois, exactly as on the lips of the Roman Catholic feudalist, is a word of double meaning or rather a word to juggle with. The recent elections in Belgium illustrate the point. Rather than run the risk of having the Socialists going further and unhitch-

ing the nation from the international carriage of capitalism, the bourgeoisie of Belgium—they are there called "Liberals"—withheld their support from the Socialist or working class (that is, the real Belgian) candidates, in their effort to cut the reins held by the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

The feudal Cooney and the bourgeois Gen. Miles are competitors for a seat on the back of the American nation, with "patriotism" only as a lure to pull in customers, i.e., pluckees.

---

## ULTRAMONTANE RIOT IN BUTTE

(Daily People, June 20, 1912)

Before us are the issues of the 14th of this month of the Butte, Mont., *Miner* and the *Anaconda Standard*. Both papers, capitalist organs, give lengthy details of the attempted mobbing of C. A. Carlson, a national organizer of the Socialist Labor Party, as he was addressing an open-air meeting in Butte on the evening of the previous day.

There is no discrepancy in the reports by the two papers. In all essentials they tally exactly.

Carlson, standing on a soap box, on which lay some S.L.P. literature, was explaining the class struggle, and illustrating the facts he mentioned with the conduct of the political parties of capital, lay and clerical. In substantiation of this, he took up a copy of Prof. Simarro's review of the clerico-judicial assassination of Francisco Ferrer. What Carlson said at this point is given by the Butte *Miner* more fully than by the *Anaconda Standard,* and in quotation marks:



"The world is divided into two nations. The churches, both Catholic and Protestant, and particularly the former, are always with the rich. I hear men talking out in the crowd and know that they are workingmen who are upholding this system. Why, it was only a short time ago that a wealthy Hebrew donated $25,000 to the Catholic Church so that it might combat the growth of Socialism. Every cardinal, archbishop, bishop and priest in this country is fighting the Socialists today."

It is true that there are but two nations in the world today—the capitalist class, which exploits and lives upon the sweat of the brow of the working class, and the working class, the sweat of whose brow, through unrequited toil, feeds, clothes, houses and fattens the capitalist class.

It is true that the church organizations, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, side with the rich. The fact is so many-sidedly obvious that all denominations feel the effect thereof. The Protestant churches are at their wit's end to replenish their empty pews; while the Roman Catholic churches, although boastful of "crowded services," are but too well aware of a serious and increasing leak—a leak so serious from the side of labor that all the "conversions" of rich women and Presidents' sisters-in-law cannot calk it; and that, abroad, is causing monks and nuns to be chased by Catholic countries out of their territories; and that, in Germany, has just lost Cologne to the Clerical party.

It is true that the affinity of organized religion, so called, with the rich and against the workers is so strong that even a Jew recently did donate $25,000 to the Catholic Church to combat Socialism, that is, the

movement for the abolition of wage slavery and the realization of the Biblical precept, "If any would not work, neither should he eat."

It is true that in this crusade against Socialism the Roman Catholic Church leads. It is most active. Whether it be at the funeral of a New York archbishop, or the laying of the cornerstone of a new Buffalo cathedral, or the graduation exercises of a Catholic school, or whatever the public occasion, tirades of various lengths and various degrees of bitterness against Socialism are never missing from the numbers of the program. And, what is more, the Roman Catholic hierarchy is ostentatiously proud of its anti-Socialist activities.

As to Carlson's allegations of fact, they are undeniable. How about Carlson's exercise of the right of free speech? Did he, perchance, abuse the right?

None will resist more zealously than the S.L.P. man the desecration of free speech with attempts to cover up with its name obscenity, scurrility, vileness of utterance or riotous noise. Carlson's speech bore none of these earmarks; to that fact the Butte *Miner* and the *Anaconda Standard* bear witness. In orderly manner and objectively, he was piling fact upon fact, and drawing his conclusions. Nor is this all. Carlson was not a free-lance street-corner exhorter. He was the spokesman of a political party—the Socialist Labor Party—addressing his fellow citizens. Carlson was delivering a political speech. The political speech that does not attack opposing political parties may be a thing known in Paradise. It is unknown on earth. Such attack is practiced by all political bodies—the Roman Catholic political party setting the pace as above indicated and,



what is more, setting the pace against the Socialist political movement in particular.

By whichever test—the test of veracity or the test of the right of free speech, especially by a political party with regard to others—Carlson's words are tested, they were eminently legitimate.

And yet, what was the conduct of the members of the Roman Catholic political body in the crowd addressed by Carlson, in the face of Carlson's exercise of that most solemn of all manifestations of the right of free speech—political free speech? Did they reveal the benevolence, the charity, the patience of the Nazarene? No! Did they even exemplify the decorum of civilized man at a public meeting, a political meeting at that? Yet, again, no!

According to the Butte *Miner* and the *Anaconda Standard,* when Carlson reached the end of the passage quoted above, Bart Monahan, described as a "stockbroker," yelled: "If we have any red blood in our veins we will compel this vilifier to move on," and two other worthies, McKevitt and Tierney, took the hint. They then acted as "ringleaders," rushed at Carlson, snatched the book out of his hands and tore it up, and, followed by others of their kind, they pursued Carlson until they were arrested in their felonious career and taken to jail.

None more so, none as much as the organs of the S.L.P., have held high the political right of the Roman Catholic political machine to agitate and propagandize as freely as any other political organization in the land. However abhorrent the Roman Catholic political program, however time-condemned as a scourge to the human race, the working class in particular, civi-

lization demands freedom of political expression, agitation and propaganda. However, the political organization whose products can so debase themselves against the genius of the age as did stockbroker Monahan and those upon whose willing ears his guilty words fell, such a political organization, unless it promptly repudiates the felony, gives just grounds to see the rack and the stake—which it used against its adversaries whenever it had power—casting before them their fatidic shadow. Such a body reads itself out of the pale of political bodies; it stands forth, self-branded, a center of riot—a menace to the land.

---

## SOCIALISM COMPLIMENTED

(Daily People, June 26, 1912)

A Cleveland, Ohio, correspondent sends to this office a copy of the *Catholic Universe* of that city, with date of May 24. An editorial, "The Church and Politics," is marked—specifically, the following paragraph in the editorial:

"As we have said before, we do not favor a clerical party in this country. We are afraid that it may come as the only convenient and effective offset to a rising tide of Socialism."

Our correspondent, indignant at the clerical presumption of expressing itself against Socialism, of which clergymen know nothing, asks: "How is this for high?"

To us, the editorial and the paragraph are a compliment, more than a compliment, a homage to Socialism.



"Catholic" means universal. The Roman organization, being "Catholic," is universal. What it is in one place it is in another. Being avowedly a political party in several countries—Germany and Belgium, for instance—it must be the same everywhere else. Accordingly, in this country as elsewhere, the Roman Catholic machine is a political machine.

Political strife is a strife of reasoning. Where political strife is liveliest, discussion is most general. Political activity and blind submission are incompatible. Political activity repels authoritarianism. Adverse political parties regard one another as peers, much the same as the contending lawyers before a jury; and just as these, political parties endeavor to win over the jury —the voters. "Argument" is the weapon in politics—the only effective one today.

The weapon of the Roman Catholic machine, however, is not argument. In this country we have had a sample thereof.

When Father Edward McGlynn declared himself the partisan of the Single Tax political movement, it was logical enough for the Roman Catholic political machine to denounce him. The Single Tax, though far from being an emancipator of the proletariat, certainly was a menace to the landlord class, a class in which the Roman machine is a star member. But while denunciation—argument cannot always be distinguished from denunciation—was in order from the Roman Catholic political machine, it resorted to something else besides denunciation. That something else was a weapon inherited from the dark and feudal ages when the Roman machine, though a political machine, was the sole one allowed or allowable. That weapon was "Anathema."

In order that the many sided features of this weapon may be fully appreciated, we here reproduce the anathema and excommunication of Father McGlynn, officially read to the people in Latin on July 8, 1887, under Leo XIII, by Michael Augustine, Archbishop in Christ Corrigan. Here it is in full, as published by the Central News Company, Philadelphia. A copy of it can be found in the Forty-second Street Library, bound together with about twenty other documents on different subjects in a fat green book. Here it is:

By the authority of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost, and of the undefiled Virgin Mary, mother and patroness of our Savior, and of all the celestial virtues, angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, powers, cherubim, seraphim, and of all the holy patriarchs, prophets, and of the holy innocents, who in the sight of the Holy Lamb are found worthy to sing the new song of the holy martyrs and holy confessors, and of the holy virgins, and of all the saints together, with the holy and elect of God. We excommunicate and anathematize this malefactor, Edward McGlynn, and from the thresholds of the holy church of God Almighty we sequester him, that he may be tormented, disposed and delivered over to Dathan and Abiram, and with those who say unto the Lord God, "Depart from us, we desire none of thy ways." And as fire is quenched with water, so let the light of him be put out for evermore, unless he shall repent "and make satisfaction." Amen.

May the Father who created man, curse him!

May the Son who suffered for us, curse him!

May the Holy Ghost, who was given to us in baptism, curse him!

May the Holy Cross, which Christ, for our salvation, triumphing over his enemies, ascended, curse him!

May St. Michael, the advocate of holy souls, curse him!

May all the angels and archangels, principalities and powers, and all the heavenly armies, curse him!

May St. John the Praecursor, and St. John the Baptist, and St. Peter and St. Paul, and St. Andrew, and all other Christ's apostles, together curse him!

And may the rest of his disciples and four evangelists, who by their preaching converted the universal world, and may the holy and wonderful company of martyrs and confessors, who by their holy works are found pleasing to God Almighty, curse him!

May the choir of holy virgins, who for the honor of Christ



have despised the things of the world, curse him!

May all the saints, who, from the beginning of the world to everlasting ages are found to be beloved of God, curse him!

May the heavens and earth, and all the holy things remaining therein, curse him!

May he be cursed, wherever he be—whether in the house or in the stables, the garden or the field, or the highway, or in the path, or in the wood, or in the water, or in the church!

May he be cursed in living, in dying, in eating or drinking, in being hungry, in being thirsty, in fasting, in sleeping, in slumbering, in waking, in walking, in standing, in sitting, in lying, in working, in resting, in urinating, in going to stool, and in blood-letting.

May he be cursed in all the faculties of his body! May he be cursed inwardly and outwardly! May he be cursed in the hair of his head! May he be cursed in his brains!

May he be cursed in his vertex, in his temples, in his forehead, in his ears, in his eyebrows, in his cheeks, in his jawbones, in his nostrils, in his foreteeth and grinders, in his lips, in his throat, in his shoulders, in his wrists, in his arms, in his hands, in his fingers, in his mouth, in his breast, in his heart, in his bottomest stomach and its appurtenances, in his reins, in his groin, in his thighs, in his genitals, and in his hips, his legs, his feet, and his toe nails!

May he be cursed in all the joints and articulations of his members, from the top of his head to the sole of his foot!—May there be no soundness in him!

May the Son of the living God, with all the glory of his majesty, curse him! and may heaven, with all the powers which move therein, rise up against him, and **damn** him, unless he repents and make satisfaction! Amen.

So be it, so be it! Amen.

Whence we hold—what greater compliment, or homage, can be paid to the soundness of Socialist reasoning by the usurping class than by its fetching out of the armory of the dark and dreary Dark Ages, and as its last resort against Socialism, a political party whose main weapon is an actual declaration of intellectual bankruptcy? What greater compliment or homage to Socialism than for modern usurpation to feel driven back to the Dark Ages, and to push and pull the Roman Catholic political machine to step forward in its true colors—the autocratically secular?

## THE UNIVERSAL MONARCHY

(Daily People, October 1, 1913)

In the authorized publication, issued last September 28, of his views on and favoring "the reunion of the scattered branches of Christendom," Cardinal James Gibbons conditions, as "the first essential requirement," the recognition of the Pope as the head of Christendom on the ground that "every organization, whether religious, civil or political, needs a head for its peace and security, indeed for its very existence."

As Socialism deals not with religion, we have no opinion concerning the correctness or the incorrectness of the cardinal's dictum, in so far as it is to the effect that a religious organization needs an international head, one head the world over, and that head the Pope, for its peace, security and very existence. The cardinal may be right for all that Socialism is concerned.

In so far, however, as the cardinal's dictum expressly embraces civil and political organizations, the dictum concerns Socialism intimately.

Inasmuch as the identical Pope, who the cardinal holds should be the head of Christendom, asserts his claims as a temporal, that is, a civil and political, power, the cardinal's dictum resolves itself into these conclusions:

1. The United States, being a civil and political organization, should be under the overlordship of the Pope for the country's peace, security and very existence.

2. All other nations—they being likewise civil and political organizations—should likewise, for the sake of



their peace, security and very existence, be under the overlordship of the Pope.

3. An international overlordship would turn the world into a universal monarchy, with the Pope as the monarch.

There is no escape from these conclusions as inevitable from the civil and political theory set up by Cardinal Gibbons. That theory Socialism rejects and human progress has overthrown for all time, as destructive of liberty, as corrupt, as vicious — and it is so branded by that most enlightened and pious movement among Catholics themselves, to wit, the Modernists.

---

## IS IT FAIR?

(Daily People, November 21, 1913)

A correspondent forwards to us a copy of the New York *Live Issue*, an Ultramontane publication, of last October 18, accompanied with a letter referring to a passage in an article that appears in the said paper and that criticizes the grand opera, "The Huguenots," for introducing a Cardinal of Lorraine "as being in Paris and blessing the daggers that were to be instruments of bloodshed and carnage." The *Live Issue* protests that, as the Cardinal of Lorraine was not in Paris but in Rome on the night when the dagger-blessing scene occurs in the opera, "even dramatic license stands aghast, while reason and judgment call an emphatic halt"; on account of this the paper demanded, in justice to Catholics, that the producers of "The Huguenots" print on the program that "the scene in which

the Cardinal of Lorraine is represented as blessing the daggers is not based on facts." Pointing to these passages, our correspondent asks: "Is not that fair?"

No; it is not fair.

Whether or not the Cardinal of Lorraine was in Paris on the occasion, and demeaned or did not demean himself in the way represented in the opera, can only be a matter of historic accuracy that concerns the personal character of the cardinal. If he was not in Paris and did not so demean himself, appeal might with justice be made for a correction in behalf of his good name, giving him credit for being one of the few members of the Ultramontane hierarchy who were not stained with the Ultramontane infamy of the St. Bartholomew's Night. That would be fair. But it is not in behalf of the cardinal that the appeal is made. The appeal is made in behalf of Ultramontane Catholicism.

Is Ultramontanism misrepresented in that scene of "The Huguenots"?

Without delving into ancient history, barely three years ago the Italian government let loose the dogs of war against Tripoli. It was a war for conquest and rapine, unprovoked and wanton. Only one voice rose in Italy to protest against the inhumanity of the move. That voice was the voice of Socialism, in marked contrast with which the present incumbent of the Papacy—a typically Ultramontane personage, as transpires from his fulminations against the Modernist Catholics who denounce the papal temporality — prayed for and blessed, yes, blessed, the flags and the arms, military and naval, that were to carry bloodshed, massacre and devastation among the people of Tripoli.

Nor will it boot to argue that the Tripolitans were



Mohammedans, and not Christians. That Ultramontanism has no Christian feeling for Christians who refuse to submit to its temporal yoke was demonstrated less than a year ago in this very country. The *Christian Herald* of November 27, 1912, quoted the Ultramontane Father Phelan as saying in the *Western Watchman*: "We would like to rack and quarter Protestantism; we would like to impale it and hang it up for crows to build nests of; we would like to tear it with pincers and pierce it with red-hot irons; we would like to fill it with molten lead and plunge it into hellfire a hundred fathoms deep."

Nor yet will it boot to argue that all this "racking," "quartering," "impaling," "hanging," "tearing with pincers," "piercing with red-hot irons," "filling up with molten lead" and "plunging into hellfire is not meant to be done to human beings in the concrete, but to Protestantism in the abstract.

Only eight months before Father Phelan pronounced himself, another Ultramontane officer, Father John L. Belford, stated black upon white in the April number of his *Nativity Mentor* that the Socialist "is the mad dog of society and should be silenced, if need be with a bullet."

The case is clear. Ultramontanism has today, as it ever had, only death for those who choose not to accept its temporal yoke—provided of course it has the power. This being the case, the dagger-blessing scene portrayed a historically correct psychology. To demand a correction of the scene "in justice" to Ultramontanism is supremely unfair. It is the demand for a falsification of history that causes reason and judgment "to stand aghast."

# GALILEO

(Daily People, December 8, 1913)

Lay and clerical Ultramontane agencies, engaged in the work of cleaning their political organization of the soilure of mental, hence also of physical, despotism, have undertaken the task of "rectifying historical distortions" in connection with the great mathematician, physicist and astronomer, Galileo, who held that the earth moved around the sun, and not the sun around the earth.

We shall consider the efforts of two of these "rectifiers." They, the efforts, are typical of the output. One of the "rectifiers" is a lay Ultramontane organ, the New York *Live Issue;* the other is a clerical Ultramontane official, the Rt. Rev. Monsignor Patrick J. Supple, D.D., of Dorchester, Mass.

The argument of the *Live Issue,* November 22, consists:

First, of a denial that Galileo was tortured or persecuted by the Ultramontane authorities;

Second, of the admission that the Roman Inquisition forbade Galileo to advocate the Copernican theory and ordered him to renounce it as false and contrary to Scripture, and the admission that for not obeying "he was condemned to confinement," but "spent altogether only twenty-two days in the building of the Holy Office," that is, "in the handsome and commodious apartment of an official of the Inquisition";

Third, of the charge that leading Protestants, such as Luther and Melanchthon, and leading scientists, such as Tycho Brahe and Bacon, either held up Galileo's



theory to scorn or entertained grave doubts about its soundness;

And, fourth, of the declaration that the attitude of the Ultramontane authorities, instead of being "a proof of the Church's hostility to scientific progress, proves to have been an episode which reflects the general tendency of the age."

The argument of Monsignor Supple, made before the Common Cause Society, at Boston, on November 30, and reported in a markedly sympathetic style in the Boston *Post* of the next day, consists:

First, of a denial of the torture and persecution versions;

Second, of the admission that the Church forbade Galileo to disseminate his ideas and that, since he persisted, he was made "a prisoner, perhaps, but no more than the Pope today is a prisoner in the Vatican";

Third, of the declaration that "at no time did the Pope, as head of the Roman Catholic Church of the world, either condemn or support Galileo";

And, fourth, of the declaration that "the attitude of the Church in forbidding the public dissemination of Galileo's ideas was justified, bearing in mind always the spirit of the times"; and that he was sure that, had he "been living at that time," he, Monsignor Supple, "should have held the same position."

The two "rectifications of historical distortions" follow the identical line, differing from each other only in so far as each supplements the other, with the upshot that they "rectify" nothing worth rectifying, and that the alleged "distortions of history" emerge unscathed.

In the first place, everybody knows that history is written by men, and that "men are flesh and blood, and

apprehensive." There is no history, written by a man of woman born, that does not bear the writer's stamp. The stamp may be more or it may be less biased; but biased it is, unavoidably so. The searcher after truth brings with him that knowledge. A process of analysis and elimination will enable him to discount the bias and reach the substantial fact.

Whether Galileo received ten turns of the thumbscrew or only three; whether he was placed "behind bars" or "imprisoned in a palace"—all that is a matter of coloring, is of relative unimportance. The question is: Was he ordered to renounce his knowledge, forbidden to propagate his theories, and was force applied to enforce the prohibition? From the "rectified" and from the "unrectified historic distortions," the colossal historic fact leaps forth that Galileo, a scientist whose breast and brain heaved with the throb of a prime principle in natural science, was constrained to renounce his knowledge, constrained by the Holy Office or Inquisition, an agency of the then omnipotent, all-pervading theocratic power. Animals of low organism may have a leg pulled off without suffering great pain; high organisms writhe with pain at the extraction of a hair. To a Galileo, the physical and mental duress under which he was placed was the outrage of a torture—and the torture was inflicted at Rome itself, under the shadow of the Vatican. In our own days, we saw an Ultramontane Pope quickly resent the anti-landlord economic theories of the venerated Father McGlynn in this city, order him to retract and report to Rome, or stand excommunicated *ipso facto et nominatim*. Under the very eyes of the then Pope, without a word of reproof, hence, with at least the Pope's tacit consent, the



outrage was inflicted upon Galileo and, over his back, upon scientific progress.

And this colossal historic fact is matched with another, a sociologic fact, that likewise leaps out of the "rectified" and the "unrectified historic distortions," indeed, is underscored by the "rectified" ones.

Both the *Live Issue* and Monsignor Supple extenuate the conduct of the prelacy against Galileo by the spirit of their times. The Socialist historian may and does make the argument, inasmuch as he denies ex-officio sanctity to all men. Ultramontane lips, however, are estopped from making the apologetic argument. A body that claims to represent the Deity cannot extenuate its misconduct at any time by the spirit of that time. Wrong at one time, unreliable at all times.

As Don Quixote wisely said to Sancho Panza on a certain memorable occasion, we say to the Ultramontane politicians, clerical and lay, and of whatever title: *"Peores meneallo"*—you make the stench of the stenchful past only worse by stirring it up.

---

## THE "INDEX"

(Daily People, December 25, 1913)

In its issue of December 17, the New York *Normal College Bulletin* contains a report of a recent meeting of the college's Barat Club, at which the Rev. J. F. X. O'Connor delivered an "informal talk." The report of the "informal talk" contains this passage:

"He began by telling us that it is far better not to read at all than to read certain books, which, as a caution, the Catholic Church had placed on the Index. The

Index, Father O'Connor told us, may be compared to certain laws of the State. There are laws, for instance, restricting auto speed. They restrict the liberty of the chauffeur, that is true, but they protect human life. There are laws restricting smoking, etc., in city conveyances. They hamper the liberty of the individual, but they preserve the health of the public at large."

Among the books that have at one time or other been enrolled in the Index, and the reading of which must, according to Father O'Connor's analogy, have been prohibited in order to "preserve the health of the public at large" was the Bible. That happened in 1551 (Index prohibitory of Valencia, Valladolid and Toledo). Sixty and odd years later, 1616, under the papal will of Paul V, Galileo, and thereby Copernicus and Kepler, "all the works maintaining the mobility of the earth and immobility of the sun," landed on the Index, and remained there until 1757. Finally, coming down to our own immediate days, we find in the latest Index of the late Leo XIII, published in 1900:

Among prohibited works of philosophy, Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason"; Montaigne; Descartes; Grotius, the founder of international law; Locke's "Essay on the Human Understanding"; Spinoza, whose works Goethe said he ever took up as a tonic for human abnegation; etc., etc.

Among prohibited works of history, Gibbons's monumental work, "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire"; Oliver Goldsmith's charming "History of England"; Hallam's profound work on the "Constitutional History of England"; D'Aubigne's painstaking work on the "History of the Reformation"; etc., etc.



Among prohibited works on the natural sciences, Darwin; Giordano Bruno; etc., etc.

Among prohibited books on social science, John Stuart Mill; Auguste Comte; John Milton; Montesquieu; etc., etc.

Among prohibited works of literature, Victor Hugo's "Les Miserables"; Taine's "History of English Literature"; Eugene Sue's historic novels; etc., etc.

In the introductory chapter to his recent work, "The Censorship of the Church of Rome," George Haven Putnam says:

"A very large proportion, one may say by far the largest proportion, of the world's literature that stood for intellectual activity and insight, literature which expressed the conclusions of the greatest minds of their several generations, and which stood for the development and the civilization of the community itself, had been placed by the Church in the Index of condemned and prohibited books."

And the pious and enlightened Modernist Catholic, who in October, 1897, condemned in the *Contemporary Review* the Index issued by Leo XIII, tersely put the case in this sentence:

"As St. Paul strenuously opposed himself to the circumcision of the flesh, so would the Liberal Catholics oppose themselves to the circumcision of the intellect."

Accordingly, an examination of the contents of the Index, down to our own days, arouses grave doubts concerning the soundness of Father O'Connor's analogy between the books placed on the Index and auto speeding, or smoking and the like forbidden things in city conveyances; and it arouses the suspicion that not "the health of the public at large" but the "health" of

political rulers, whose rule demands public ignorance, is served by the hampered liberty that the Index imposes or seeks to impose. A closer scrutiny of Father O'Connor's analogy ripens the suspicion into certainty.

Father O'Connor compared the Index to certain State laws. The comparison is inadmissible. There is not one of our State laws but is enacted by individuals elected by the people and removable by the people. The enactments of the Index are enacted by members of a close and self-perpetuating corporation, superimposed from above and unremovable from below—unless they are physically yanked down and out, as has been repeatedly done in New Jersey, in Pennsylvania, in Colorado and surely in other states besides, by Polish, Italian and other irate Catholics who found no other way for removing some particularly obnoxious political oppressor in clerical clothes.

From whatever angle one views Father O'Connor's analogy, dished out to Normal College girls, between the Index and State laws, the analogy is incorrect; so incorrect as to be false; so false as to be misleading; so misleading as to be insidiously deceptive; so insidiously deceptive as to be immoral—guilty of that immorality which consists in the attempt to impose upon and trepan the human intellect.

To quote once more from the distinguished Modernist Catholic quoted before, it is a fundamental principle "not only that the God of truth can never be served by a lie, but that the cause of religion can never be promoted by clever dodges, by studiously ambiguous utterances, by hushing up unpleasant truths, or (when such can no longer be hidden) by misrepresenting or minimizing their significance—trying by a series of



clever devices to disguise the consequences which logically follow from them." All of which points to the fact that the title of "Father," prefixed to J. F. X. O'Connor, is not the title of a religious office, but is the title of a politician intent upon promoting the interests of a political machine that is ambushed behind religion —the Ultramontane political machine, the aim of which is to subvert the American polity of individuality, personal responsibility and organized democracy, and substitute for it the dead grip of Dark Ages theocratic autocracy.

---

## SO SAY WE ALL

(Daily People, January 1, 1914)

In its December 11 issue—an issue that, as usual, bubbles with assaults upon Socialism and Socialists—the Syracuse, N.Y., *Catholic Chronicle,* a weekly issued by a company of which James K. McGuire is the president, publishes with evident approval a news item taken from a paper in the neighboring town of Rome, N.Y., under these headlines:

"Ordered to Leave the City.

"Woman Who Was Taking Subscriptions for a Magazine Containing Articles Reflecting on the Roman Catholic Church."

The headlines, explicit enough one should think, hardly do justice in point of explicitness to the report that they head.

The report is to the effect that, "on complaint of the Very Rev. Dean James J Carson, M.R.V.F., pas-

tor of St. Peter's Church," of Rome, N.Y., Miss Tillie M. Allen of Bound Brook, N.J., who had been taking subscriptions for the *Good Citizen,* an anti-Ultramontane magazine published at Bound Brook, N.J., by Mrs. Anna White, was arrested and arraigned before Judge Baker, "charged with violation of Section 1,340 of the penal law, a misdemeanor which relates to the publication and distribution of articles which reflect on any religious society"; that Attorney M. I. Powers, who represented the Rev. Father Carson, stated to the court that "they did not wish to imprison Miss Allen but would like to have her expelled from the city"; that Judge Baker acquiesced and Miss Tillie left the city that same afternoon by trolley to Utica, Officer McLaughlin being "instructed to see that she left according to instructions."

There is one more fact that the express language of the report justifies being incorporated in it. Section 1,340 of the penal law, mentioned in the report and described as covering "a misdemeanor which relates to the publication and distribution of articles which reflect on any religious society," reads as follows:

"1,340—Libel defined.

"A malicious publication by writing, printing, picture, effigy, sign or otherwise than by mere speech which exposes any living person or the memory of any person deceased, to hatred, contempt, ridicule or obloquy, or which causes, or tends to cause, any person to be shunned or avoided, or which has a tendency to injure any person, corporation or association of persons, in his or their business or occupation, is a libel."

A judge, guilty of the high crime and misdemeanor



of falsifying a statute, which defines libel in the only way that our laws can define the offense, that is, without making reference to religion—falsifying the statute by transforming it into a prohibition against publishing and distributing "articles which reflect upon religion," and who, on top of that, aggravates the high crime and misdemeanor by enforcing the penalty of expulsion from a city, a penalty unknown to our state laws; in short, a judge rotten-ripe for impeachment proceedings—

A lawyer, who makes so dishonorable an argument as the argument needs must be in support of such statute falsification; in short, a lawyer rotten-ripe for disbarment—

A limb of the Ultramontane political machine setting the ball a-rolling along the plane of the Inquisition that even the real—not the New York—Rome has cast off since it cast off the yoke of Ultramontanism—

An Ultramontane publication seeking to deceive the people as to the facts concerning the theory of our criminal law, by attempting surreptitiously to set up the theory of the Dark Ages, and brazenly publishing the attempt—

That Ultramontane publication being issued by a company of which a man is president who, after having given false testimony at the recent graft investigation, was confronted with facts so overwhelming that he had to eat his own words, and is now under indictment for graft—

These facts, prime and enticing though they are for comment, must not be allowed to eclipse the most valuable fact of all that leaps to sight from the Rome, N.Y., report in the columns of the Ultramontane *Catholic*

*Chronicle*--the fact of the loud, however tacit, proclamation, by agencies of Ultramontanism, that it is not a religion at all but just what Socialism has all along argued, to wit, a business, or a political concern ambushed behind religion.

Religion cannot be libeled under the law. It is not a "person," either actual or as a "fiction of law." In whatever instance criminal proceedings for libel apply, an actual individual or a corporation must have been injured, and either has a case for damages at law—damages to the character of the individual or to his or to the corporation's "business" or "occupation" as the statute provides. The aggrieved entity, according to the report itself, is not a person. According to the report itself, its reading-matter and its heading, the entity that claims to be aggrieved is, expressly, the "Roman Catholic Church"—meaning in the report, of course, not Modernist Catholicism, which denounces the political and business so-called Catholic Church as unavoidably corrupt and tyrannous. The "Roman Catholic Church" which the report refers to is the Ultramontane political and business hierarchy.

By claiming that it is libeled, the agencies of Ultramontanism read Ultramontanism within the statute; by reading Ultramontanism within the statute, they proclaim the status of Ultramontanism to be that of a "corporation or association of persons" that pursues a "business or occupation," which occupation or business can be damaged in dollars and cents.

Socialism welcomes the admission. So say we all.



## OUR ALLIES THE ULTRAMONTANES

(Daily People, January 5, 1914)

While the insolent posture struck by the two clerical delegates of the American Federation of Catholic Societies at the late Seattle convention of the A. F. of L., together with the cowed attitude of the convention in sight of that posture—as summarized by the Socialist party's organ, the New York *Call,* of the 19th and the 20th of last month—will send a cold chill of despondency down the spine of many, both the posture and the attitude cause only delight and encouragement to all who have carefully followed the American labor movement for the last thirty years, and who are at all versed in the philosophy of history.

Despite the confused presentation in the *Call,* and despite the disingenuous repudiation of the *Call's* report by the Albany *Catholic Chronicle* of December 11, and by Father Dietz in the New York *Live Issue* of December 27, the *Call's* summary of the posture struck by the delegation of the American Federation of Catholic Societies—"Roman Catholic bishop warns A. F. of L. delegates to Seattle convention to beware of Socialism, if they don't want Church to form rival unions in this country"—is correct; and correct also is the *Call's* summary of the attitude of the convention, the Socialist party men at the convention included, in sight of the Ultramontane threat—"No delegate apparently resented the ultimatum. Nobody took the floor to accuse the Church of trying to 'disrupt the unions.'"

Socialist philosophy teaches that the classconscious economic organization of the proletariat, in short, the union, is the breath in the nostrils of the Socialist move-

ment, and, vice versa, that Socialism is the breath in the nostrils of the union. Obedient to this philosophy, throughout the civilized world Socialist political activity and union economic activity have been in close touch—in some countries intimately so, as in Sweden, where the representatives of the Socialist movement have had a seat in the conventions of the unions; or as in Belgium, where conventions of the Socialist political body and those of the unions have been held at the same place, the adjourned convention of the one immediately becoming the convention of the other; or less intimately in other countries, as in Germany, where, nevertheless, Socialist political representatives constitute the leading and pace-setting officials and members of the unions; in all countries, even Great Britain, the two, the Socialist political and the union economic movement move or endeavor to move in accord, according as the lay of the land might allow.

Obedient to the same philosophy, the Socialist Labor Party strove in this country to spread classconscious information among existing unions and to build up new ones by the same plumb line.

This is another way of saying that the S.L.P. strove to strike the shackles of reaction off the mind of the proletariat in general, of the allegedly organized, but in fact disorganized, workers in particular. And this, again, is another way of saying that—never forgetful of the Party's duty toward the proletariat in all their working class acts, and ever loyal to the proletariat, however organized, in their conflicts with the master class—the Party strove to smash the A. F. of L. as the bulwark of capitalism and reaction in the land.



The policy of the S.L.P. was opposed by an element which centered in the New Yorker Volkszeitung Corporation. In the measure that the policy of the S.L.P. moved along successfully, the opposition thereto grew intenser. Both the fact of the success that the S.L.P. policy was meeting and that of the desperateness of the opposition are reflected in the admission made by the *Volkszeitung*, September 2, 1909, that it became necessary for it to sacrifice Socialist unity in the land in order to save the A. F. of L.

The consequence was the split of 1899 in the Party. That did not yet "save" the A. F. of L. Beaten to a standstill on all the three fields—the courts, the hustings and the shops—on which they issued their challenge to the Party, the seceders fled for asylum to the political movement that Eugene V. Debs had just started in the west.

The S.L.P. held its breath in gladness, hopefully expectant.

Debs was no A. F. of L. man. Far otherwise and to the contrary. He had no superstitious horror for "rival" or "dual" unions; nor yet did he entertain any superstitious reverence for "boring from within." If the structure of an economic organization was wrong and there was no other way to mend matters, he believed in setting up another union, and he boldly practised what he preached. What is more, he rose to prominence as a leader of just such practices. Indeed, it was at the time, and even since then off and on, hard to tell Debs from the S.L.P. so far as the union question was concerned. The expectation seemed justified that the political movement, which Debs, as a leader in the formation of revolutionary unions, had conjured into ex-

istence, would be animated with his breath. As a consequence, it was expected that the seceders from the S.L.P. would be captured by the political asylum to which they had fled. As a further consequence, it was hoped and even expected in 1900, and the expectation rerose in 1905 when the I.W.W. was launched with the joint assistance of Debs and the S.L.P., that A. F. of L.ism would be uprooted. It all happened the other way. The seceders from the S.L.P. captured their political asylum; the A. F. of L. was "saved."

But the genius of progress is not to be jockeyed. When conditions are unfavorable to the removal of that which blocks the path of progress, the obstacle is not "saved"; its removal is only adjourned. What the method is by which the genius of progress proceeds, the philosophy of history tells us. Under the pressure of continued blows, out of the evil itself which constitutes the obstacle, further and still more typical evils are bred. Evil generates evil, evil is piled upon evil until, through their corroding effect, the obstacle is self-dissolved, almost self-removed, ready for the final blow which gives it its quietus.

Before the split of 1899 in the S.L.P.; before the seceders had fled for political asylum to the Debs movement of the west, and captured the asylum and shaped it into the Socialist party;—before that, the sins of A. F. of L.ism, which the S.L.P. had been exposing, were the ordinary sins of lack of classconsciousness—high initiation fees and dues, the closing of the books against new members, the practical scabbing of union upon union, the echoing and supporting of bourgeois cries of war, etc., etc.—together with the ordinary corrupt practices that flow from class blindness—the starting of strikes obedient to the behest of competing employers, the political traffic upon the rank and file conducted by the labor leaders, etc., etc.



After the split of 1899 in the S.L.P.; after the seceders had fled for political asylum to the Debs movement and captured the asylum, and shaped it into the S.P.:—after that, the fatuous A. F. of L. feeling of having been "saved" ripened its rapidly succeeding fruits. The sins of A. F. of L.ism not only multiplied and spread like confluent smallpox, they also deepened in dye. The microscopic exploration of Mr. John Mitchell to the contrary notwithstanding, the National Civic Federation did not rise above the horizon until 1901, when it bolted into sight with Mark Hanna as its president, trailing the Gomperses and Mitchells after it in vice-presidential and other candle-holding ranks; and, later still, the convention of the A. F. of L.—a body which, at its Detroit convention of 1890, refused admission to the New York Central Labor Federation on the ground that a political party, the S.L.P., was represented in the said C.L.F., and that the "pure and simple unionism" of the A. F. of L. barred politics and religion from its conventions as factors disruptive of union solidarity—the convention of that very body accepted without a murmur, without a murmur even from the S.P. men present, delegations from purely religious organizations, that is, from organizations which, being fatedly reactionarily political, cloaked in religion, combined in themselves the two features most destructive to the solidarity of labor. The Ultramontane delegation of the Ultramontane "American Federation of Catholic Societies" typified the others of its kind on the floor of the A. F. of L. conventions, and, as a matter

of course, soon eclipsed them all and bluntly took the lead.

Evil was fast breeding evil under the incubation of the activity of the S.P.—an activity that frequently manifested itself in slander and calumny against the integrity of the S.I.P.—an activity that supplemented its calumny and slander of the S.I.P. with praises of the A. F. of L. as "nobly waging the class struggle"—an activity that hypocritically set up in justification of its policy the novel and baroque principle of Socialist "neutrality toward the unions"—an activity that, in short, threw the mantle of Socialism over A. F. of L. iniquity and even officiated as rounder and gouger for the A. F. of L.

Balls of that sort, once set rolling, roll onward and downward to their destination.

When Francisco Ferrer was judicially murdered in Spain by an Ultramontane government for endeavoring to educate the proletariat, and the instinctive classconsciousness of the American proletariat caused them to pass resolutions condemnatory of the murder, the Ultramontane John Mitchell arrogated to himself the right to "apologize" for the resolutions, in the name of organized labor and on the ground that "the unions were misinformed." And, moving from step to step, the delegation of the Ultramontane political machine threatened the A. F. of L. wih Catholic unions if it failed to block Socialism.

The threat is not an idle threat.

Here is the place to repeat two principles—one general, the other concrete—that have more than once been expressed in these columns and cannot be too much emphasized.



The general principle:

However numerous may be the corruptly and mischievously moved personnel of a large body, there will ever be found a foundation of good intentions at the bottom of the body, without which good intentions the corrupt and mischievous would have no field.

The concrete principle:

Despite all the corruption and all the injury to humanity that is justly laid at the door of Ultramontanism, there is at the bottom of Ultramontanism an honest conviction, without which its corrupt and malign agencies could not stand.

The goal of Ultramontanism is as lofty as that of Socialism—human happiness and social order.

The difference between Socialism and Ultramontanism lies in the means to the end or, be it, the premises from which they start. The premises or means of Socialism are individual responsibility, hence mass enlightenment, without which, Socialism maintains, no lasting human happiness and social order can be established; the premises or means of Ultramontanism are individual mental dependence upon a ruling hierarchy, hence mass ignorance, without which, Ultramontanism feels convinced, society will be kept in perpetual turmoil and suffering. The point has been elaborated in detail in Chapter XIII of the pamphlet, "Father Gassoniana."*

Now, then, a providential fatality ever drives on wrong convictions, just because honestly and sincerely entertained—drives them on to their own undoing. The Ultramontane *non possumus* illustrates the fact. Corrupt and ill-intentioned men may seek to profit, honest

*Now published as "Abolition of Poverty."

and well-intentioned men are controlled thereby. The honesty of the Ultramontane conviction compels it to be true to its theory of society. Not all the experience of the past, demonstrating the indomitableness of the human intellect against which fact Ultramontanism has been shattered the world over, will teach it better. Honestly wedded to its biologically and sociologically wrong conviction and premises, and its eye fixed upon its lofty goal, Ultramontanism is incorrigible. It cannot help itself. The consequence will be the "Catholic union," as certain as the morrow's sun will rise—and certainly such a move, by smashing A. F. of L.ism, will mightily aid the progress of the Socialist movement through its demonstration of the soundness of the S.L.P. principles.

"God moves in a mysterious way his wonders to perform." Unimaginable as the thing once was, Ultramontanism has actually become the handmaid and ally of Socialism.

(*The End*)



## ULTRAMONTANISM

"The first and fundamental characteristic of Ultramontanism is its championship of a logical carrying out of the so-called 'papalistic system,' the concentration, that is, of all ecclesiastical power in the person of the Roman bishop. . . .

"In 1865 Dollinger wrote: 'The Ultramontane view can be summarized in a single, concise, and luminous proposition; but out of this proposition are evolved a doctrine and a view that embrace not merely religion and the church, but science and the state, politics, morals and the social order—in a word, the whole intellectual life of men and nations. The proposition runs: The pope is the supreme, the infallible, and consequently the sole authority in all that concerns religion, the church, and morality, and each of his utterances on these topics demands unconditional submission—internal no less than external.' History, since the Vatican Council, has shown this judgment to have been correct. . . .

"A second peculiarity of Ultramontanism is its confusion of religion with politics; it claims for the Roman Catholic Church the functions of a political power, and asserts that it is the duty of the secular state to carry out its instructions and wishes. Ultramontanism regards the state, not as a divinely established order but, like its ancient prototype, as a profane institution and, for that reason, not coordinate with, but subordinate to the church.

"Since the conditions of the age no longer allow the pope to depose a temporal sovereign, the practical application of this conception of the relationship between the spiritual and temporal powers has taken other forms, all of which, however, clearly show that the superiority of the church over the state is assumed. This may be seen in the attitude of Ultramontanism toward secular law. It assumes that God has conferred on the individual and on society certain rights and competences as inalienable possessions. This 'natural law' ranks above all secular law, and all state legislation is binding only in so far as it is in harmony with that law. As to the provisions of this natural law, and the consequences they entail in individual cases, these can be decided only by the church, i.e. the last resort, by the pope. This is to assert the principle of the invalidity of all legislation conflicting with ecclesiastical interests and rules. This was the attitude of Innocent III when he annulled the English Magna Charta; of Innocent X when he pronounced the Treaty of Westphalia null and void; of Pius IX when he condemned the Austrian constitution (1868) and the ecclesiastical laws of Prussia so far as they affected the circumstances of the Roman Catholic Church (1875). Thus too, even at the present time, the opinion is very clearly expressed in Ultramontane quarters that, in the event of the state issuing laws contravening those of nature or of the church, obedience must be refused. . . . Thus Ultramontanism disclaims any moral subjection to secular authority or law, and will recognize the state only in so far as it conforms its rules to those of the church.



An instance of this interference with the duties of the individual citizen toward the state may be found in the fact that, till the year 1904, the Catholics of Italy were prohibited by the pope from taking part in any parliamentary election.

"Since Ultramontanism cannot hope to realize its political ambitions unless it succeeds in controlling the intellectual and religious life of Catholic Christendom, it attempts to extend its sphere of influence in all directions over culture, science, education, literature and the forms taken by devotion. This endeavor is the third great characteristic of Ultramontanism. . . . In logical sequence to these tenets it seeks to divorce the school from the state—a proceeding which it terms educational freedom, though the underlying motive is to subordinate the school to the church. In the domain of religion, Ultramontanism tends to foster popular superstitions and to emphasize outward forms as the essence of religious life, for it can only maintain its dominion so long as the common people remain at a low spiritual level. . . .

"Ultramontanism, again, though essentially averse from all forms of progress, had displayed great dexterity in utilizing the opportunities presented to it by modern life. Where it appeared advisable, it has formed itself into a political party, as for instance, the Center party in Germany. It has shown extreme activity in the creation of a press devoted to its interests, and has consolidated its influence by the formation of an extensive league-system. . . ."

— From the "Encyclopedia Britannica."

## THEOCRACY OR DEMOCRACY?

*By Arnold Petersen*

A definite drive is on for the official use of "religion" for capitalist purposes. This work traces recent attempts by President Roosevelt and others to palm off "religion" as "the source of democracy" and as an "official" institution. The background is furnished to the attempts in an analysis of mankind's past theocratic experience with "God in government."

192 pp.—$2, cloth. (Postpaid.)

---

## ABOLITION OF POVERTY

*By Daniel De Leon*

A series of instructive and thought-provoking editorials on questions which today rank as among the most vital. Originally published as "Father Gassoniana," since the Ultramontane program of the Jesuit Thomas I. Gasson, who had launched an attack on Socialism in Boston in 1911, is here exposed as "the economics and sociology of the dark ages."

72 pp.—25c., postpaid

---

## FIFTEEN QUESTIONS ABOUT SOCIALISM

*By Daniel De Leon.*

An Ultramontane paper asked fifteen "loaded" questions about Socialism with the intention of putting Socialism "on the spot." De Leon answered the questions, and, in so doing, kicked the props from under the social posture of Ultramontanism and further strengthened the case for Socialism. This pamphlet ranks with Marx's "Gotha Program" in its exposition of the operations of the Socialist society.

128 pp.—30c., postpaid

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS COMPANY
61 Cliff St., New York 38, N.Y.

## Democracy, Past, Present and Future

*By Arnold Petersen*

An understanding of the contents of this Marxist study will inoculate the worker-reader against the lie that democracy and capitalism are synonyms one for the other.

The work shows what democracy meant in the slave society of ancient Athens, what it means under capitalism, and what it will mean in the Socialist society. It shows the need for **industrial** democracy—the form of democracy that brings "the rule of the people" to its highest, and most meaningful, form of expression.

80 pages—Price 25 cents, postpaid

NEW YORK LABOR NEWS COMPANY,
61 Cliff St., New York 38, N.Y.

---

**WEEKLY PEOPLE**

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY

Read the WEEKLY PEOPLE, official organ of the Socialist Labor Party, a paper of revolutionary Socialism and Industrial Unionism. Rates: $2 a year; $1 for six months.

WEEKLY PEOPLE
61 Cliff St., New York 38, N.Y.

---

SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY,
61 CLIFF ST., NEW YORK 38, N.Y.

I am interested in Socialism. Please send me information and free literature published by the Socialist Labor Party, including sample copy of the *WEEKLY PEOPLE*, official organ of the Socialist Labor Party.

*Name* .....

*Address* .....